



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/25/3366841

5 Charles Court, Great Preston, Leeds LS26 8FN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ben Robinson against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/01805/FU.
 - The development proposed is described as “the proposed works consists of removing the existing roof and trusses etc and replace with dormer type trusses to increase the ridge height in order to construct a rear dormer for a loft conversion. In addition to this, two number bay windows will be constructed to the front elevation.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling of brick construction with a gable roof. It is located within a residential area of detached and semi-detached dwellings of either two, two and a half or three storeys, which creates visual interest that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The dormer window would be a large, boxy addition that would span across a significant extent of the rear roof slope. Although dormer windows are present on other nearby properties, these are located to front elevations and are much smaller in size. The proposed dormer would be an uncharacteristic addition not seen to other dwellings that would appear dominant due to its size and elevated position. The proposed windows would also be larger than, and fail to align with, those on the floors below, which would exacerbate its discordant appearance.
6. I accept that the dormer would accord with the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) in terms of the use of matching materials, and in it being set in from the sides, eaves and ridge of the roof slope. However, its size and fenestration pattern would conflict with the SPD guidance, which seeks dormers to be as small as possible with a substantial area

of the original roof retained, and for window detailing to match the character, proportion and style of the original house. Consequently, it would not respect the character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposed raising of the roof height of the dwelling would be viewed in the context of a wide range of different roof heights in the vicinity of the site. As a result, it would be in keeping with the character of the area.
8. Notwithstanding the acceptability of the increased roof height, I have found harm to the character and appearance of the area in regard to the proposed rear dormer. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to saved Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policy P10 of the Leeds City Council Core Strategy (2019) and the guidance set out within the SPD, which together seek to ensure that alterations are of an appropriate scale and design having regard to the existing building and the wider context. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is well-designed and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. There is no dispute between the parties regarding the acceptability of the proposed bay windows to the front and I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion.
10. I note the appellant's desire to create more usable space for their family as well as the financial benefits of the appeal scheme for the appellant. However, these are modest, private benefits which are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issues. I have also had regard to the appellant's submission that there are no objections to the proposal. However, the absence of objections is a neutral factor in the planning balance and does not preclude a full and proper assessment of the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
12. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR